

Notice of Allowability

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|----------------------|--------------|
| 10/810,057 | HE ET AL. |
| Examiner | Art Unit |
| Christopher A. Daley | 2111 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTO-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. This communication is responsive to 3/21/2005.
2. The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-34.
3. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some*
 - c) None of the:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) hereto or 2) to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____.
4. Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material
5. Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6. Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____.
7. Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. Other _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:
2. Independent claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record because the examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art found any motivation to combine any of said prior art. The following limitations were not found in the prior art of record:

masking the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt

Source;

calling a second-level handler if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source; and

unmasking the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt Source.

Dependent claims 2 – 7 are rendered allowable, as associated independent claim 1 is allowable.

Independent claim 8 is allowable over the prior art of record because the examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art found any motivation to combine any of said prior art. The following limitations were not found in the prior art of record:

masking the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt

Source;

determining if a second-level handler is installed for the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source;

calling said second-level handler if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source and a second-level handler is installed for the interrupt source; and unmasking the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt

Source.

Dependent claims 9-13 are rendered allowable, as associated independent claim 8 is allowable.

Independent claim 14 is allowable over the prior art of record because the examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art found any motivation to combine any of said prior art. The following limitations were not found in the prior art of record:

a first-level handler caller coupled to said installed first-level handler determiner;
an interrupt source masker coupled to said installed-first level handler determiner;
an installed second-level handler determiner coupled to said interrupt source masker;
a second-level handler caller coupled to said installed second-level handler determiner;
and an interrupt source unmasker coupled to said second-level handler caller.

Dependent claims 15-19 are rendered allowable, as associated independent claim 14 is allowable.

Independent claim 20 is allowable over the prior art of record because the examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art found any motivation to combine any of said prior art. The following limitations were not found in the prior art of record:

means for masking the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source;

means for calling a second-level handler if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source; and

means for unmasking the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source.

Dependent claims 21-26 are rendered allowable, as associated independent claim 20 is allowable.

Independent claim 27 is allowable over the prior art of record because the examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art found any motivation to combine any of said prior art. The following limitations were not found in the prior art of record:

means for determining if a second-level handler is installed for the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source;

means for calling said second-level handler if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source and a second-level handler is installed for the interrupt source; and

means for unmasking the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source.

Dependent claims 28-32 are rendered allowable, as associated independent claim 27 is allowable.

Independent claim 33 is allowable over the prior art of record because the examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art found any motivation to combine any of said prior art. The following limitations were not found in the prior art of record:

masking the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt

Source ;

calling a second-level handler if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source; and

unmasking the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source.

Independent claim 34 is allowable over the prior art of record because the examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art found any motivation to combine any of said prior art. The following limitations were not found in the prior art of record:

masking the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt

Source;

determining if a second-level handler is installed for the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source;

calling said second-level handler if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source and a second-level handler is installed for the interrupt source; and

unmasking the interrupt source if a first-level handler is not installed for the interrupt source.

3. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Daley whose telephone number is 571 272 3625. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am. - 4p m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on 571 272 3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CAD
3/06/2006



REHANA PERVEEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
3/6/06

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "REHANA PERVEEN". Below the signature, the text "SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER" is written in a smaller, printed-style font. To the right of the signature, the date "3/6/06" is handwritten.